

**THE  
BASIC  
FACTORS  
IN  
BRITISH  
GREATNESS**

**MICHAEL YOUNG**

**2/6**

## CONTENTS.

---

	Page
1. Introduction     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...	2
2. Law and the Constitution     ...     ...     ...	3
3. Economics     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...	16
4. Britain and the Christian Faith     ...     ...	25
5. Conclusion     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...	34
6. Bibliography     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...	38

## INTRODUCTION.

**D**URING the last few years we have been witnessing the shameful betrayal of all traditional British conceptions by our leading politicians. To cap it all the Prime Minister has been making determined efforts to subjugate us to European bureaucrats and to break up the British world beyond recovery.

It is humiliating that in these last few days it has fallen to a remarkable Frenchman, who is standing, according to his lights, for the greatness of France, to save us from our folly and to point out that Britain is an insular and maritime nation with world-wide connections, differing fundamentally from the nations of Europe and that we, as a nation, could not enter the European Common Market, except at the price of dishonour.

In the following pages an attempt has been made to indicate, very briefly, the basic factors in Britain's rise to greatness in the past. It is the gradual losing sight of these truths since the end of the 17th century which has produced the conditions leading to our present alarming decline. This has been written in the hope that it is still possible for the British people to wake up and make a last stand for the truth.

A bibliography has been provided at the end of the booklet to enable readers to pursue the subjects in much greater detail.

January 29th, 1963.

# Law and the Constitution.

**I**N the beginning God gave mankind a Law and we are told that Abraham walked according to it (Gen. 26: 5). It was observed by the patriarchs of the East, as is shown by the fact that a contemporary of Abraham, Hammurabi, embodied it in his Code. In the book of Jasher we are informed that Abraham learned it in the household of Noah and Shem, and that he introduced it into his father's house in Ur of the Chaldees.

Later this Law was given by God to Moses who wrote it down in the Pentateuch. It was brought to Britain by the earliest settlers when they came from the Crimea area and was embodied in the original laws of Britain by King Brutus, about 1100 B.C., after the arrival of himself and other Trojans.

Lord Chief Justice Coke wrote:—

“The original laws of this land were composed of such elements as Brutus first selected from the ancient Greek and Trojan institutions.”

A later King, Dunwall or Molmutius, re-codified the laws, about 450 B.C., and Coke in his “Origin of the Common Law of England” wrote that:—

“the Molmutius laws have been always regarded as the foundation and bulwark of British liberties.”

Under the laws of Brutus every subject was as free as the King. The laws in force were the *Cyfreithiau* or “Common Rights.” The Usages of Britain could not be altered by any act of the Crown or National Convention. They were now considered the inalienable rights to which every Britain was born, and of which no human legislation could deprive him. One of these Usages was:—

“There are three things belonging to a man, from which no law can separate him—his wife, his children and the instruments of his calling, for no law can unman a man, or uncall a calling.”

Among the laws as enacted by Molmutius is the following:—

“Three things are indispensable to a true union of nations: sameness of laws, rights and language.”

Later again the laws were codified by King Alfred, who quotes almost verbatim from Moses. The law was again incorporated in “Magna Carta,” and later again in the Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement.

This very ancient system of law, for long known as the Common Law, has been retained throughout the ages by England alone. From a time centuries before Christ the Jews had been losing it under the influence of the Talmud and of subjection to other peoples. The East

eventually became subject to Mohammedan Law. The Roman Civil Law came to hold sway nearly everywhere in Europe, except in Britain.

The Common Law of England has, of course, been spread about parts of the world during recent centuries where Britain has held sway.

A great difference between the Civil Law and the Common Law is that the Civil Law holds that every man—and every nation—is guilty until he has proved himself to be innocent whereas the Common Law holds that every man—and every nation—is innocent until he has been proved to be guilty. This Common Law applies equally to all in the land from the Monarch to the lowest and has the effect of conferring legal democracy on the people. It is essentially the most righteous system of law in the world, as has been stated by a number of eminent foreign Jurists.

This legal democracy based on our Common Law led to the evolution of our Constitution which, throughout the ages, until the last hundred years or so, was as described by Blackstone in his “Commentaries on The Laws of England”—

“In all tyrannical governments the supreme magistracy, or the right both of making and of enforcing laws, is vested in one and the same man, or one and the same body of men; and whenever these powers are united together, there can be no public liberty. The magistrate may enact tyrannical laws, and execute them in a tyrannical manner, since he is possessed in quality of dispenser of justice with all the power which he, as legislator, thinks proper to give himself. But where the legislative and executive authority are in distinct hands, the former will take care not to entrust the latter with so large a power, as may tend to the subversion of its own independence and therewith of the liberty of the subject. With us, therefore, in England, this supreme power is divided into two branches; the legislative, to wit, the Parliament consisting of the King, Lords and Commons; and the other, the executive consisting of the King alone.”

Under this system it was the duty of the King to command to his Privy Council the men whom he thought most fitted to enable him to govern the country. If a member of the House of Commons was appointed to the Government he had to resign his seat in the House. The House of Lords, besides being a Senate, was the supreme Court of Common Law in the country. The House of Commons was composed of men elected by the constituencies to represent them in Parliament.

There were no political parties and therefore all the members of the Commons were “Independents.” Their duty was to represent their constituents and to act in accordance with their conscience. As there were no party organisations the constituencies were free to choose the men they thought best for the job. There was freedom of election.

The duty of the members of the Commons was to keep vigilant watch to see that none of the King's ministers in conducting the government did anything that would infringe the liberty of the subject. Their power of sanction lay in the fact that they controlled the purse and could impeach any Minister before the House of Lords, if they thought such a course to be necessary in the interest of good government.

The idea was that the three parts of Parliament—King, Lords and Commons—were of equal standing and the system worked best when they worked amicably in equality. Trouble was apt to arise if the balance got disturbed by one of the parts getting or trying to get too powerful at the expense of the others. The great strength of the Tudors, Henry VIII. and Elizabeth I., lay in the fact that they understood the Constitution and knew the limits to their power.

This ancient and historic constitution based on the principles of English legal democracy under the Common Law, has proved to be the finest and most enduring system of government in the civilised world and under it every Englishman had freedom of action.

The resulting achievements of the British at home and abroad were remarkable.

This legal democracy rested on fundamental law, applied to the wide divergent social issues by the reasoned decisions of the lawyers in the courts of law, and the separation of the legislative and executive authorities.

The whole system rested on the consent of the people and all its officials were responsible to the people through their elected representatives in the Commons.

The Civil Law must now be described. Roman Law was the great achievement of Roman lawyers applying the fundamental principles of the Twelve Tables to the problems of Roman social life. With the passing of Rome its authority ended but when re-discovered in the revival of learning, a call arose for the Civil Law to be adopted in place of the native laws of the various countries in Europe.

Being of a highly technical character it could only be imposed by order of the ruler or, as in England, used as a source of legal reasoning and brought into native law as thought desirable. For its authority it did not claim that it was based on fundamental legal principles but that it rested on the will of the ruler who could alter it as he thought fit. This doctrine became known as the *Lex Regia*, and is described in the Institutes of Justinian as follows:—

“That which seems good to the Emperor has all the force of law; for the people by the *Lex Regia* which is passed to confer on him his power makes over to him their whole power and authority. Therefore, whatever the Emperor ordains by rescript or decides in adjudging a cause or lays down by edict is unquestionably law . . .”

This idea of will and caprice as the sole source of law gave birth to the idea that rulers derived their absolute authority from God alone and not from the people. Outside England law ceased to be a subject for lawyers, who became mere civil servants applying the will of the ruler, and instead it became a subject for academic speculation on constitutional and legal principles in the universities. Under these theoretical conditions all sorts of ideas of political democracy took root and led to the ecclesiastical and political movements and revolutions of western civilisation which were aimed at the revocation of the *Lex Regia* but failed, in that the result was merely to substitute the will of the people in place of the will of the ruler, i.e., one source of lawlessness for another.

The effect of the adoption of the Roman Civil Code is the total destruction of all constitutional law and the subversion of all constitutional institutions. This was clearly shown in the case of Scotland which had been for centuries a Common Law country, with legal ideas and institutions similar to those of England. The "Declaration of Arbroath" had been the "Magna Carta" of Scotland but, in 1370, the Scottish Parliament gave up its power to an independent committee which became The College of Justice and which adopted the Civil Law in Scotland although it was never authorised by a Scottish Parliament. The result was that the Scottish Parliament became a mere rubber stamp for the use of the King of Scotland and for any ruling factions that arose. The king became a legislative sovereign ruler, the source of all law. This is why there was so much trouble when the Stuarts mounted the English throne. They had been brought up in a constitution diametrically opposed to that of England and failed to adapt themselves to it.

The English opposition to the Civil Law ideas has been on record from as long as seven hundred years ago, in the writings of Bracton and his successors. Five hundred years ago, Fortescue, in his "*De Laudibus Legem Angliæ*," made the contrast between Common Law and Civil Law Kingdoms when he wrote:—

"For the King of England is not able to change the laws of his kingdom at his pleasure, for he rules his people with a power not only regal but also political. If his power over them were only regal then he might change the laws of his realm and charge his subjects with taxes and other burdens without their consent; and such is the dominion that the Civil Laws claim when they state:—'The Prince's pleasure has the force of Law.' But the case is far otherwise with a king ruling his people politically, he can neither change the law without the consent of his subjects nor yet charge them with impositions against their will. Wherefore his people fairly and freely enjoy and occupy their own goods being ruled by such laws as they themselves desire."

After nearly a century of trouble with the Stuarts and with Cromwell the English Constitution was again re-affirmed in the Act of Settlement and Bill of Rights.

The Act of Settlement had the following peroration:—

“Whereas the Laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof and all the Kings and Queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm ought to administer the government of the same according to the said laws and all the officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same; the said Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons do therefore humbly pray:—That the laws and statutes of this realm for securing the established religion and the rights and liberties of the people thereof and all other laws and statutes of the same now in force, may be ratified and confirmed and the same are by His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the said Lords, spiritual and temporal and Commons and by authority of the same, ratified and confirmed accordingly.”

The principles thus enacted remain to this day the fundamental law of our constitution.

But after that we began to run into further trouble. Corruption set in as a result of (a) political parties beginning to emerge; (b) of the Union with Scotland, a Civil Law country; (c) and of having more kings brought up with Civil Law ideas.

The Union with Scotland had unfortunate results in that the House of Lords now had to deal with appeals from the Court of Session and it knew nothing about the Civil Law. The members began to lose interest in their legal duties through being unable to understand the new jurisprudence about which English judges were of little help. At the same time a rapid increase in the membership of the House began as a result of party political activities and this led to a great decrease on the part of the membership in their traditional pride in their duty to understand and judge in accordance with the Common Law. Eventually, by the Judicature Act of 1870, our supreme Court of Common Law was virtually suppressed.

The Act of Settlement contained the following vitally important clause relating to the purity of the representative principle:—

“No person who has an office or place of profit under the King or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons.”

But the new interests achieving power by means of constitutional corruption managed to get the above clause amended so as to allow Members of the House of Commons to retain their seats while holding office in government and administration, under conditions by which the intention of the clause was virtually defeated, and the House of Commons became open to the influence of public patronage and the



management of its members. Instead of being a control on those who exercise national authority it became subservient to them.

George III. had been brought up under the influence of his mother who was a German princess from a Civil Law principality. She also took care to surround him with tutors and advisers holding similar conceptions of kingship. The result was that Scotsmen played a leading part in his education and in his early administrations, notably William Murray, as Solicitor General, and later, as Lord Chief Justice of England under the title of Lord Mansfield. Now Mansfield, though an English judge was a Roman Lawyer, seeing the foundation of jurisprudence to be the Roman Civil Law and not appreciating the merits of the Common Law or the love of public liberty displayed by many of its maxims.

By means of the power given him by patronage George III. found himself able to achieve a personal rule with the support of the Commons as complete as Charles I. had tried to establish in opposition to the House.

Under Lord Mansfield the entirely new conception was introduced that an absolute passive obedience was due to Parliament which must not in any way be questioned, much less resisted, by the people. He insisted that:—

“When the supreme power abdicates, the government is dissolved” and, therefore, that every means of coercion is justified to enforce authority.

As a result of these ideas Mansfield was largely responsible for the revolt of the American colonies and other troubles. Opposition to Mansfield's ideas was strongly expressed by men like Edmund Burke and William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, but, in spite of this, we now have for all practical purposes a Civil Law set-up of government by the Prime Minister, who has usurped the Royal Prerogative power of patronage.

This unconstitutional state of affairs has been attained by the development of the Party System and of what are known as Constitutional Conventions, although they are, in fact, unconstitutional and opposed to the fundamental law of the land.

It is interesting to note that when the American colonies obtained their independence they introduced a written constitution based on the Common Law of England with the President performing, more or less, the functions the King should perform in our constitution. The result is that they have been able to keep their political parties under legal control and their legal democracy has been able to confine and control the will as expressed by political democracy.

What we now call Parliamentary Government is really Party Government and the fundamental difference between it and the old English and present American systems is that by the Party system the supreme executive authority is appointed by the legislature from among

its own members, i.e., the legislative and executive functions have been combined in one body, the Cabinet, whereas under the latter systems the supreme executive appointments are made by the legal head of the state from outside the members of the legislature. The Americans have retained rule by law, which we have abandoned in favour of rule by Party. The Conventions referred to above are merely the rules the Party system has adopted to enable it to exercise power outside the Constitutional Law.

As Sir Ivor Jennings writes in his "Law and Constitution":—

"Most of the 'Conventions' relate to the operation of the party system, which is merely an aspect of Cabinet Government. The principles governing the working of that system have never been formally recognised by Parliament or the Courts. So far as the Courts are concerned, they developed too late. The principles of constitutional law established by the Courts recognise the constitution of the Revolution Settlement. Institutions and practices which have grown up since that time have not received formal recognition by the Courts and the rules relating to them are not part of the Common Law. Accordingly, the rules relating to the foundation and operation of the Cabinet, the relations between the Prime Minister and other Ministers, between the Government and the Opposition and many more are not in Legislation nor in the Common Law nor in the law and custom of Parliament."

The party system is composed of private organisations under no legal or public control and by means of the Conventions it has destroyed all constitutional restraints. There is nothing democratic about it. What we really have now is party dictatorship.

Referring to the nature and character of Party Government Burke, in his "Vindication of Natural Society," wrote:—

"The great instrument of all these changes and what infuses a peculiar venom into all of them, is Party. It is of no consequence what the principles of any party, or what their pretensions are; the spirit which actuates all parties is the same, the spirit of ambition, of self-interest, of oppression and treachery. This spirit entirely reverses all the principles which a benevolent nature has erected within us; all honesty, all equal justice, and even the ties of natural society, the natural affections. In a word we have all **seen** . . . we have some of us **felt** such oppression from the Party Government as no other tyranny can parallel."

Such men as Lord Brougham, John Stuart Mill and Lord Bryce, in England, and Washington and John Adams, in America, also gave warnings against the party system.

The parties form an effective barrier between the people and their government. Under the Whip system the M.P. owes allegiance to the

party and not to the people. The system crushes personal independence, a totalitarian, not a democratic feature. It has led to the elimination of independent M.P.'s and the dominance of the Government over the Commons. Party rivalry is no guarantee of protection of our rights and liberties as the parties will always unite to keep out independents and in defence of the powers and prerogatives which they have stolen from the people.

In order to usurp the legal supremacy of Parliament the first step is to destroy freedom of election, which, besides the secret ballot, requires freedom of nomination and freedom of the elected representative from all influences of fear or favour, punishment or patronage. Although these freedoms are an essential part of our constitution and are incorporated in the Bill of Rights, they have been eliminated by the Party System. The idea of making candidates for election to Parliament put down a forfeitable deposit is one of the tricks designed to impede freedom of election by discouraging anyone, other than Party sponsored candidates, from standing for election. A parliament cannot be true and legal unless elected under conditions of proper freedom. What we now have is a modern form of livery and maintenance and an abuse of the legal procedure of the High Court of Parliament beside which abuses like packing a jury are insignificant.

The Monarch is the centre of our whole constitutional system because in the Monarch is vested the sovereignty of the British people and it is from this sovereignty that all legal authority is derived. By Law the Sovereignty is in the Crown and cannot be delegated. It can only be effected by Act of Parliament. Under the Law, the Monarch has only one personal function, that of being the controller of public patronage and the grant of office and honour. The appointment to executive office was only limited by the need to appoint a person who would command the confidence of the House of Commons.

But with the membership of the House of Commons under party discipline and control it was only necessary for the party managers to inform the King that no confidence will be shown in anyone not acceptable to the majority party and the personal and most significant prerogative of the Crown of appointment to public office immediately passed to the party managers. And this without any Act of Parliament having been passed. The Crown is now in the position, purely by illegal party rules, of having to treat as a command the very humble advice Ministers choose to give.

By the repeal of the clause in the Act of Settlement prohibiting members of the Commons from holding office and the usurpation of the Royal Prerogative, the party managers became free to nominate themselves to the highest offices so that, by party action in the Commons, the sovereignty of the English monarchy and therefore of the English people and the supremacy of English law has been usurped and destroyed.

As Sir Lewis Namier said in 1952:—

“The Prime Minister replaced the sovereign as actual head of the executive when the choice of the Prime Minister no longer lay with the sovereign; the sovereign lost the choice when strongly organised disciplined parties came into existence; and party discipline depends primarily on the degree to which the member depends on the party for his seat.”

For all practical purposes we now have a republic with only the trappings of a monarchy and the whole process has been carried out in complete contempt of the ancient law of the land.

The experience of Cromwell and the Protectorate showed the central truth that our constitutional monarchy in its sovereign capacity was the guardian of the rights and liberties of all Englishmen and their free parliamentary institutions.

Now, Prime Ministers having usurped the Royal Prerogative, we have become for all practical purposes a nation of serfs.

We have seen how the Monarchy and the people, as represented in the Commons, have been eliminated from the Constitution. We have also seen earlier how the House of Lords ceased, for all practical purposes, to be our Supreme Court of Common Law, and this was probably one of the biggest factors leading to the present corruption of the constitution and the reception of the alien jurisprudence which made that corruption possible. But as one of the institutions of Parliament the House of Lords could have been a barrier to the usurpation of government by private political organisations, but when the Royal Prerogative as the fountain of honour came under the control of the party managers it was used for party ends to get representation in the Lords and to raise money for party funds by the sale of honours, thus bringing discredit on the House and destroying its constitutional power.

The predominantly hereditary character of the Lords arose from the party actions of creating so many peers. The threat of an unlimited creation of peers was used to force through the Parliament Act of 1911, thus destroying the co-ordinate independence of the Lords.

The party usurpation of our parliamentary institutions is now complete. The sole duty of Parliament, consisting of Queen, Lords and Commons, being to approve the commands of the Cabinet acting under what has now become, for all practical purposes, the dictatorship of the Prime Minister, and to give a legal form to these commands.

The Party System has the inevitable effect of producing a partisan, as opposed to a national, outlook. It divides the nation, keeping it in a sort of cold civil war state. While the attention of everyone is concentrated on this suicidal pastime the Satanically inspired forces of evil are left free to get on with robbing the nation of everything of value that it possesses.

Walter Paley, in his "Political and Moral Philosophy," published in 1782, wrote:—

"By the constitution of a country is meant so much of its law, as relates to the designation and form of the legislature; the rights and functions of several parts of the legislative body; the constructions, officers, offices and jurisdiction of courts of justice. The constitution is one principle division, section or title of code of public laws distinguished from the rest only by the superior importance of the subject of which it treats. Therefore the terms **Constitutional** and **Unconstitutional** mean legal and illegal. The distinction and ideas, which these terms denote, are founded in the same authority with the law of the land on any other subject, and to be ascertained by the same enquiries. In England, the system of public jurisprudence is made up of Acts of Parliament, of decisions of Courts of Law, and of immemorial usages. Consequently these are the principles of which the English Constitution consists; the sources from all our knowledge of its nature and limitations is to be deduced and the authorities to which all appeal ought to be made and by which every constitutional doubt and question can alone be decided . . ."

The Cabinet is not and never has been a part of our legal constitution. From the beginning it has been a malevolent growth which has destroyed the most vital principle in our constitutional system, that of ministerial responsibility to Parliament, having adopted secrecy and collective action, so that ministers cannot now be impeached by the Commons as the Commons cannot find out for what any individual minister is responsible.

Thus we who pride ourselves on democracy have allowed ourselves to reach the stage of being despotically governed by a secret council, sworn to silence, for which there is no basis in English Law.

There is now nothing to safeguard the national interests and our national destiny is bound to party appointments made for party ends, regardless of the suitability of the men for the posts to which they are appointed. Besides being unconstitutional, the system is criminally insane. Under irresponsible and unsuitable ministers we naturally get an immense army of government officials who exercise despotic power in all sorts of ways and who are exempt from any public and personal responsibility to Parliament. There is no room for Statesmanship or integrity. Everything is reduced to the sordid immediate consideration of deluding the public into voting as required by the respective parties in order to retain or obtain the sweets of office.

The Party system denies the existence of fundamental law and this modern denial is associated with John Austin who repudiated English Common Law ideas and turned with respect to the Roman Civil Law. He got his ideas in Germany when the Philosophy of Totalitarian Dictatorship was being incubated.

Popular institutions such as our Parliament can only retain their character if they are subject to a fundamental law which holds them true to their purpose and, if the law is destroyed, there is nothing to prevent them being corrupted into becoming the instruments of despotism instead of being the guardians of law, as was clearly shown by the experience of Scotland, mentioned earlier.

Austin and Dicey supported the idea that the sovereignty of Parliament is, from the legal aspect under the British Constitution, absolute to the extent that it could even ignore the law of nature, although that law was a common feature of all civilised legal systems, and although, for example, the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland gives no hint of an absolutely sovereign legislature but throughout conveys the idea of a supreme Parliament bound by fundamental law. What the modern idea that there is no fundamental law means in constitutional matters is made quite clear by Professor Gough when he states:—

“It was with the Benthamite principle of utility (although this itself was only natural law in a new form) accompanied by the introduction of Parliamentary reform that modernity really began to make itself felt. Then at last the relics of the idea of fundamental law gave way before the realisation that there was nothing to hinder the possessors of power from using it to promote their own interests and that how to do so most successfully is the art of politics.”

Obviously, no constitutional system of value can survive on these principles.

Dicey, when defining parliamentary sovereignty, was forced to do so in terms of constitutional and fundamental law. Parliament has no legal authority whatsoever unless it is conforming to law. We have a legal constitution based on the fundamental Common Law of England, laid down as described by Walter Paley above, but smothered by the unwritten Conventions. Dicey confused the issue.

In law our Constitution is as rigid as is the American with its written constitution.

The statutory rules and orders now flooding our legal system have no validity, being only accepted as law in conformity with the Austinian doctrine, as stated by C. H. S. Fifoot, in his “English Law and its Background.”

A sinister development has been the setting up of independent Courts of Law, known as Administrative Courts, which have developed a procedure incompatible with English legal procedure. They are based on Civil Law and not on Common Law principles and are designed to dodge the Statute of Northampton in which it is enacted that justice and right should be done regardless of the command of the government. They have no “day in court,” no jury, no decisions governed by precedent; the judges are civil servants and the decisions

given are not even those of the hearing judges. The judgments are not reasoned. Their purpose is to enforce the will of the rulers regardless of justice and right or of the consent of the people.

It is now firmly established in our modern system that even in peace time Britons have no fundamental or constitutional rights, such as were guaranteed for ever by our fundamental law contained in Magna Carta, etc., and expressed in the Petition of Right in the following terms:—

“That all and singular the rights and liberties ascertained and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this Kingdom.”

One example of loss of rights is that of the right of appeal to the Sovereign. If anyone now writes appealing to the Queen in connection with what is thought to be unjust treatment received at the hands of a Government department, all that happens is that the bureaucracy surrounding the Queen, in accordance with the modern “Convention,” passes the appeal to the department in question, where it is put in a pigeon-hole. The Queen hears nothing about it and the appellant is butting his head against a brick wall.

The remarkable split-mindedness of our modern legal authorities is well illustrated by the fact that Sir Hartley, now Lord, Shawcross, had to appeal to Common Law principles in order to try to make a case against the Germans during the shocking mockery of justice in the war crime trials at Nuremberg,\* because it was not feasible to do so under Civil Law principles, but, at the same time, when feeling it to be necessary to praise at home the principles he had been condemning as criminal at Nuremberg, he could say to an English audience, as reported in the “Times,” May 13th, 1946:—

“Parliament is sovereign; it can make any laws. It could ordain that all blue-eyed babies should be destroyed at birth, but it has been recognised that it is no good passing laws unless you can be reasonably sure that, in the eventualities which they contemplate, those laws will be supported and can be enforced.”

The above is pure Civil Law and amounts to the fact that in the opinion of such lawyers the Cabinet now has the legal power to do anything, not being bound by any considerations of natural or fundamental law. This is utter lawlessness and a fatal corruption in the soul of the British people.

As Burke said, the whole point about the English Constitution as it developed under law over the ages was that it was designed to produce good governors, whereas other constitutions were satisfied with trying to produce good subjects.

It is clear that if you have good governors you have a very good chance of having good subjects and it should now be obvious, judging

\* See the books by F. J. P. Veale, mentioned in the Bibliography.

by what has happened in Britain since the last war, that if you have bad governors you soon get corrupted subjects.

It is hoped that enough has been said above to show that we now have a Government based on a system entirely contrary to the ancient Constitution and fundamental law of the land and completely contrary to the dictates of commonsense, in that it cannot fail to do other than result in the greatest possible corruption of the character of the people and the destruction of all proper national interests.

If we had gone into the Common Market we would have been subjected to men with a different background, men with ideas of law and liberty of the subject entirely opposed to those for which we have stood and fought throughout the ages. The legal democracy which we used to have would have been something beyond their ken and we would have become the slaves of whoever was wielding power from behind the scenes.



# Economics.

**W**HEN God gave the law to Moses, He laid it down that the Israelites were not to lend on usury (i.e., interest) to one another. The word usury means increase or interest. The modern tendency to confine its meaning only to what might be thought to be extortionate interest is merely one of the modern ways of dodging the truth.

The Koran does not allow Mahomedans to charge interest. In Britain, under the Common Law, Christians were not allowed to charge interest, but non-Christians were, and by the time of Edward I. the non-Christian money-lenders had reduced the country to such a parlous state that, in 1290, he took the necessary steps to stop their financial activities.

Unfortunately, under Henry VIII., money was permitted to be loaned at a rate under 10%. Edward VI. reversed this concession to usurers, but Elizabeth I. renewed it. This was because money was, as now, not understood and gold and silver, which was regarded as almost the only real money, was being hoarded by individuals. With increasing trade requirements more money was required as a lubricant to facilitate exchange and the lending at usury was resorted to in order to tempt people to release their hoarded stocks of gold and silver. Some men began to realise that gold and silver were not the only money and the Bank of Venice was thoroughly successful in working a money system with irredeemable paper money. Left to themselves the British might well have worked out a paper money system based on a Goods Standard (like the Tithe system was always on a Goods basis until 1925) but the money-lenders were allowed back into the country again under Cromwell, and under William of Orange the National Debt racket was instituted, in 1693, to finance his continental wars and then, in 1694, the Bank of England was formed, with the result that Britain became an officially usurious nation and the slave of the Money Power racket.

If the British people do not make the very slight effort necessary to understand money and take the obvious steps required to correct the appalling mess into which we have allowed ourselves to be duped, we will soon be beyond recovery. This is very urgent because it is the criminal control of money by the Money Power which is the main means being used to force us into suicidal courses of which entry into the Common Market would have taken us past the point of no return.

Money is the simplest thing to understand. Therefore it is vital to the Money Power that people should not understand it, so a continuous stream of confusing smoke screens is poured out by its stooges, such as University Professors and City Editors in Fleet Street.

In simple societies exchange of goods was done by direct barter but as the variety of goods increased it became necessary to invent a

standard and convenient means of exchange. Money was the answer. It provided a ticket for goods and services, the only requirement being that whatever was used as money should be legally recognised as such and acceptable to all. For a long time gold was used as money because it was a rare metal and therefore a small quantity of it could represent the price of a large quantity of goods. It was easy to handle, easy to hide from thieves and almost indestructible. But with the enormous increase in business activity in modern days there was not enough gold to cover requirements and we now use the cheque system and paper money, which is declared by the Government to be legal tender and accepted by the people as such. Obviously, the money does not need to have any intrinsic value. It is a ticket entitling the possessor to goods and services of all kinds in the same way that a bus or train ticket entitles the possessor to a particular service.

It should be obvious that the quantity of money or credit available in a country at any time should be just the quantity necessary to balance the exchange of goods and services available and so that prices will remain constant. If too much money is allowed to get in circulation prices rise and, if too little, prices fall. It should also be clear that it should be the duty of the Crown to issue and regulate the quantity of money in accordance with the above requirements. By the formation of the Bank of England the Crown abdicated its duty and prerogative to a private company. The nationalisation of the Bank of England which has taken place in recent years appears to have made no difference to the situation as our politicians are now completely under the control of the Money Power, being men who are completely unfitted for their responsible positions.

The erroneous ideas of John Locke, known as "the Philosopher of the Bank of England," have had an immensely evil influence on the economy of the modern world, because he not only withdrew economics from its proper subordination to politics but withdrew both politics and economics from the moral law. He stated that money was subject to natural laws, like the tides, instead of being, as St. Thomas Aquinas taught, merely a medium of exchange, which "must keep the same value." The result of Locke's ideas is that money, which is now created by private individuals, instead of by governments, has become the master instead of the servant of politics and economics and all governments have come under the control of private financiers.

Locke's ideas were first put into practice with the foundation of the Bank of England by a Scot, William Patterson, and a group of wealthy men who came from Holland to England with William of Orange. This private firm, known as "The Governor and Company of the Bank of England," came into existence "almost by the back door" (as stated in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*) for the purpose of lending money to the government, because, as Patterson stated, the "Bank hath benefit of interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing."

The vast majority of people swallow blindly the idea that bankers are merely the custodians of their customers' money. The fact that bankers create and destroy money at will is probably not even realised by the majority of bank officials, let alone by the general public. The following quotations should be enough to convince anyone of the correctness of the fact:—

In his "Elements of Banking," H. D. Macleod, the Victorian economist, wrote:—

"When it is said that a great London Joint Stock Bank has perhaps 25 millions of deposits, it is almost universally believed that it has 25 millions of actual money to 'lend out' as it is called. It is a complete and entire delusion. These 'deposits' are not deposits in cash at all—they are nothing but an enormous superstructure of credit."

More than 50 years later, in 1931, this was confirmed by paragraph 74 of the "Report of the Macmillan Committee," set up by the Government to enquire into Finance and Industry. This said:—

"It is not unnatural to think of the deposits of a bank as being created by the public through the deposit of cash representing either savings or amounts which are not, for the time being, required to meet expenditure. But the bulk of the deposits arise out of the action of the banks themselves, for, by granting loans, allowing money to be drawn on an overdraft or purchasing securities, a bank creates a credit on its books, which is the equivalent of a deposit."

In the 14th Edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica appears the statement—

"Banks lend credit. They create the means of payment out of nothing."

When a bank debtor has collected enough money in any form to repay a bank loan, the repayment wipes out the debt; and that amount of the banker's permits-to-use, which functions as money, goes out of existence. In other words, is destroyed.

When a bank makes a loan it merely makes a credit entry in a ledger, but under the system this allows the borrower to put into circulation for his business purposes what is accepted as money although, as created by the bank, it has no backing and has cost the bank very little. There are some small costs to be met by the bank, such as printing notes and cheque books and the provision of a little coin. When the borrower returns the money the entry in the ledger is crossed out with the result that that amount of credit goes out of circulation. But the money returned by the borrower is real money in the sense that it represents the fruit of the labour of himself and of his employees. If the borrower fails to find the money to repay the loan he forfeits his business to the bank, which becomes the owner of the business by the mere process of having made an entry in one of its ledgers. But the

bank does not merely issue this fictitious money, it also charges interest on it. But it only issues credit to cover the loan, not the interest.

Only the banks make money. The business world does not make money. It only produces goods and services and in the process tries to acquire as big a share as it can of the money in circulation from the banks. But it is clear that as the banking system does not issue the money to cover the interest payments only those businesses which succeed in grabbing enough to cover loan and interest remain solvent. The rest are bound to go bankrupt or resort to further loans from the banks. Under this system bank debt, looked at as a whole, is irredeemable and the inevitable result is that the banking system gradually, by means of the most criminal confidence trick imaginable, becomes the owner of us all.

By its power of issuing and withdrawing money the banking system can produce booms and slumps at will. In booms it wins at the expense of buyers and in slumps at the expense of sellers. The secret of its success lies in being able to vary prices at will.

Some more authoritative quotations:—

“Thus all money is bank indebtedness and it is this cardinal fact that gives to the banking system the power to expand or contract the quantity of money by increasing or diminishing the quantity of bank debts.” (“Midland Bank Review,”—Feb.-March, 1934).

The Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, one time Chancellor of the Exchequer and for long the Chairman of the Midland Bank, said on January 25th, 1924, to a meeting of the bank's shareholders:—

“I am afraid that the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks can, and do, create and destroy money. The amount of money in existence varies only with the action of the banks in increasing and decreasing deposits and bank purchases . . . . And they who control the credit of a nation, direct the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people.”

In “Branch Banking,” July, 1938, appeared the following:—

“There are enough substantial quotations in existence to prove to the uninitiated that the banks do create credit without restraint and that they do create within themselves the means of repayment.”

The following testimony by Marriner Eccles, head of the Federal Reserve System of the United States, was given before the House Banking and Currency Committee in 1941:—

**Congressman Patman:** “Mr. Eccles, how did you get the money to buy those two billions of Government securities?”

**Eccles:** “We created it.”

**Patman:** “Out of what?”

**Eccles:** "Out of the right to issue money."

William Cobbett wrote in "The Political Register XVIII," July 14th, 1810:—

"I set to work to read the Act of Parliament by which the Bank of England was created (in 1694). The investors knew well what they were about. Their design was to mortgage by degrees the whole of the country . . . lands . . . houses . . . property . . . labour, the scheme has produced what the world never saw before—starvation in the midst of abundance."

Thomas Jefferson, the third President of the United States, about 1800, said:—

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power (of money) should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and to the people to whom it belongs. If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the corporation that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property, until their children will wake up homeless on the land their fathers conquered."

Abraham Lincoln, U.S. President, 1861-65, in Senate Document No. 23, 76th Congress, page 91, said:—

"The Government should create, issue and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is the supreme prerogative of Government, the Government's greatest creative opportunity."

During the Civil War, Lincoln made the following statement to Congress:—

"I have two great enemies, the Southern Army in front of me and the financial institution in the rear. Of the two, the one in my rear is my greatest foe."

It was the desire of the financial institution to gain control of the South which was the real cause of the Civil War. The slavery issue was only the propaganda smoke screen.

Gladstone once stated:

"From the time I took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852) I began to learn that the State held, in face of the Bank (of England) and the City, an essentially false position as to finance . . . The hinge of the whole situation was this; the Government itself was not to be a substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned."

In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson said:—

“A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men . . . We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely, controlled and dominated Governments in the civilised world—no longer a Government by conviction and the free vote of the majority, but a Government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men.”

Shortly before the above admission was made the Pujo Commission, which had been set up by Congress to enquire whether or not there was a Money Trust in the United States, had reported that five New York banks controlled no less than 112 financial, insurance, industrial, producing and trading, transport and public utility companies with resources in capital totalling the prodigious sum of four and a half billion pounds. On the basis of its findings it reported that:

“If, therefore, by a ‘Money Trust’ is meant an established and well-defined community of interest between a few leaders of finance, which has been created and is held together through domination over banks and industrial corporations and which has resulted in a vast and growing concentration of control of money and credit in the hands of a comparatively few men, then your committee has no hesitation in asserting that the condition thus described exists in this country to-day.”

There are in a country ordinary banks, like the “Big Five” in England, with which the public deals, the Central Bank (in England, the Bank of England) and then there is the international Money Power. The ordinary banks are controlled in their activities of lending and withdrawing credit by the action of the Central Bank in altering their deposits in the Central Bank. The Central Banks are controlled by the activity of the international Money Power in moving credit and gold about from one country to another as necessary to serve the long-term Money Power purpose of bringing the world in complete subjection to it.

This international gang of money-lenders had their H.Q. in Amsterdam but when William of Orange came to England they moved their H.Q. to London for a couple of centuries, and during this century the H.Q. has been in New York.

These people corner gold and they have kept us on a gold standard by means of the Bretton Woods trap and the International Monetary Fund. They only have to arrange to move gold about from one Central Bank to another to produce booms or slumps in one country or another, keeping economies in a continual state of stop-go insecurity and gradually forcing everything to be owned by the banking system which they control.

If one stops to think for a moment it is impossible to see what gold need have to do with the economy. It is quite useful for some

minor purposes, such as making wedding-rings or stopping teeth, but that is about all. That being so it is amazing to think that if we want to build some roads or put up some factories in Britain, and we have available in the country all the necessary engineers, men, machinery and materials, that we should then say "No, we cannot do it," just because the Money Power has moved a lump of gold from London to Paris. It is quite remarkable that a great nation should submit to allowing its economy to be controlled by foreigners by means of this system of pure bluff. Obviously it is the duty of the Government to issue the credit necessary to enable any desirable work to be carried out.

Another remarkable example of brain-washing is the communist-inspired Trade Union war against employers, or Capitalists, as they call them. It must be remembered that there are two kinds of capitalists. There are the big money-manipulators of the Money Power, like the Rothschilds, Morgans, etc., who deal in money itself, as a commodity. Essentially they are money-lenders and they do no productive work. All they do is to suck the blood out of mankind. Then there are the men, like Nuffield and Handley Page, who put up factories and employ large numbers of men to manufacture something required by the public. These men are called Capitalists and are raved against by the Communists, and the trade unionists are brain-washed into looking upon their employers as enemies. The result is chaos in industry. It is perfectly obvious that management and men must pull together in the interests of everyone connected with the factory, and of the public. It is also obvious that all the difficulties of management and men stem from the manipulations of the big money-lenders, but the latter are never mentioned, so much so that the uninitiated would think that they did not exist. It is essential to the success of the Money Power that people should be ignorant of its activities and that is why they put up the money to get the London School of Economics going in order to use it to brain-wash the public. The Communists never mention the Money Power, but then it was the New York Money Power which financed the Russian Revolution in 1917, and after the revolution fastened an orthodox banking system on Russia making it into a "Capitalist" country, in spite of its "Socialist" theories.

That is how it is that the Money Power comes to control both the American and the Russian Governments and is using them to produce chaos in the world. That is why they got Roosevelt and Churchill to follow the criminally lunatic policy of "Unconditional Surrender" so as to force the Germans to fight to the last and reduce Europe to chaos and hand it over to Communism. That is why since the war the Americans and Russians have been used, although apparently strongly opposed to each other, to break up the British and other West European Empires. It will be noted that as all the parts break off they are promptly brought into slavery to the Money Power by being brought into irredeemable debt to it. At the same time Communist control increases in all the parts. Such organisations as the United Nations

are purely Money Power inventions and as the Congo has shown so glaringly the organisation is used purely to further Money Power ends.

It will be noticed that nationalism is being strongly encouraged in non-Christian parts of the world as a means to destroy the power of the West European and British Empires, while at the same time all the propaganda in the civilised Christian nations is aimed at making nationalism a dirty word, so that their people will be duped into agreeing to the destruction of their power to resist the forces of evil, bent on subjecting them to the anti-Christian world domination in preparation.

A very graphic illustration of how the Money Power has made Britain, as Hilaire Belloc said, "dependent upon America" was given by Thomas Johnston, Lord Privy Seal in a Labour Government, when he stated:—

"Twenty men and one woman—a British Cabinet—waited one black Sunday afternoon in a Downing Street garden for a final decision from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York . . . The City, the financiers and the money-lenders in New York . . . refused to put up credits in support of a balanced budget. They demanded a cut in unemployment benefit."

What a tragic farce, because the whole thing is just a gigantic confidence trick being played by the Money Power. And no wonder Disraeli said that:—

"The world is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."

It might be asked why the Press is so silent on the subject of the Money Power. In his book, "The Root of All Evil," Sir Reginald Rowe explained:—

"The Press is hugely capitalized, must pay interest on its capital, and has to finance itself on the large scale which is so dear to the heart of the Money Power. In the present state of public ignorance no important newspaper dare affront and challenge the Money Power for fear of the consequences. Our credit-makers, the banks, serving in their turn 'big money,' could easily by a twist of the credit-screw check any such revolt."

It is surprising that no one has ever stopped to think how we got on without a National Debt until the end of the seventeenth century. It is just a colossal swindle designed to bring us into complete slavery to the Money Power. It is obvious that wars, etc., are paid for at the time by the blood, effort and materials used. It is the duty of the Government to provide the necessary exchange lubrication by the issue of debt-free money and credit, as Abraham Lincoln was doing in the American Civil War by the issue of Government debt-free money, known as "Greenbacks." It was because he intended to continue to finance U.S. loans in the future on a similar debt-free basis, and to pursue a policy of reconciliation with the Southern States, that he was assassinated and the Money Power was then able to stop his ideas being carried out and



to clamp the bankers' debt system firmly on the country, and to pursue for a dozen years a policy of the utmost repression in the Southern States, in order to ruin them and bring them in complete subjection to the Money Power.

It must be realised that a vast proportion of the National Debt is owned by the banking system and that the banks, in "lending" the money, parted with nothing. They just made entries in a ledger and then for ever afterwards by this criminal confidence trick hold the country in a terrible subjection.

History shows that all societies with a usurious money system have collapsed in time. There were banking systems in ancient Greece and Babylon. Rome was destroyed by the same means as those by which we are now being destroyed, as is clearly brought out in Guglielmo Ferrero's: "The Greatness and the Decline of Rome."

In his book, "Human Ecology," Dr. Thomas Robertson explains that a study of history shows that the world is an organism suffering from a disease with a wide variety of symptoms which always appear in a definite order. They appear in every part of the globe, except its "uncivilised" parts, and irrespective of race, nationality, climate or position. The symptoms are the whole range of social disorders, the main ones being poverty amidst plenty, civil and political disorder, frustration, loss of liberty and strife of every kind, finally ending in war. They appear under every condition except one, being found in countries on the gold standard or off it, in ones with blocked currencies, managed currencies or on barter; in countries with free trade or on tariffs, in countries full of gold or those with none, in those with access to all raw materials and those with very little, in industrial and in agricultural societies and in countries which chiefly export and those which do not. Also they appear with equal indifference under all political systems, in monarchies (constitutional or not), in plutocracies and democracies, under dictatorships of race or proletariat, under Conservatism, Liberalism, Socialism or Communism, or any other kind of politics so far tried, and also under every religion or none. They also appear under Federal Union.

An examination of the factors present in these various cases shows that there is only one which is common to all and that is financial credit—the international money system, which has almost escaped notice. The money system must therefore be the basic cause of all the troubles. This is proved to be true by the fact that where the money system is the most powerful the disease is worst and by the fact that the only communities free from the symptoms are the "uncivilised" ones which have not been fully corrupted by the money system.

If we had gone into the Common Market we would have placed ourselves under the control of foreigners completely in the Money Power grip and would soon have found ourselves impotent to oppose Money Power requirements should we, as a nation, have become alive to the need to do so.

# Britain and the Christian Faith.

**I**N connection with Law it was mentioned that the first settlers in Britain came from the East and brought with them the conceptions of law to which they had been accustomed and which bore a close resemblance to the law given by God to Noah, Abraham and Moses. They also brought with them a form of patriarchal religious faith, which became known as the Druidic, and which appears to have been much less corrupted from the truth handed down from Noah than was that which flourished in various parts of the world, after the rebellion against God by Nimrod at Babel, which led to the confusion of tongues and scattering abroad of the nations. Nimrod (Hebrew 'marad'—to rebel) was a type of anti-Christ and as Satan's agent was trying to oppose God's intention to scatter the seventy nations about the earth. Satan, as shown in the Bible from Genesis 3 onwards, wanted to prevent God's purposes in Christ and to this end needed to subject mankind into worshipping him. This meant achieving a form of world government. The attempt to do this under Nimrod was thwarted by God, but we are now working up into another attempt which will be very nearly successful, under the Beast and anti-Christ, and which will lead to the return of Christ to smash it.

Britain became the headquarters of the Druids and a number of ancient works, such as Avebury, Stonehenge, Silbury Hill, etc., show that they were considerable students of astronomy, amongst other subjects.

Sir Flinders Petrie discovered at Old Gaza gold ornaments and enamelware of Celtic origin dating back to 1500 B.C., and in reverse found Egyptian beads at Stonehenge.

The art of enamelling is early identified with Britain as is the production of tin and lead. The ancient Briton invented enamelling and was so perfect in this craft that relics in the British Museum, and the Glastonbury Museum, such as the famous Glastonbury Bowl (over 2,000 years old) and the beautiful Desborough mirror, are as perfect as the day they were made. They are magnificent examples of "La Tene" art, as the Celtic design is named, their geometric beauty and excellence being beyond the ability of modern craftsmen to duplicate.

By excelling in the mining and smelting of tin and lead and in casting metal, the British must have been intelligent in the sciences of minerology and metallurgy. It was the British mines that mainly supplied the glorious adornment of Solomon's temple. For many centuries Britain was the only country where tin was mined and refined and the

world-wide demand kept the British in close touch with the ancient powers.

After the fall of Troy, in 1185 B.C., many Trojans settled in Britain and eventually Brutus arrived and became King. He founded "New Troy" or Tri-Novantum, which later became London. Thus London was founded several centuries before Rome. The list of British kings from Brutus to the coming of the Romans makes very interesting reading. A few details follow:—

EBRAUC, 994 - 954 B.C.—Founded York and Dunbarton.

LEIR I., 942 - 917 B.C.—Founded Carlisle.

HUDIBRAS, 917 - 878 B.C.—Founded Canterbury and Winchester.

BLADUD, 878 - 858 B.C.—Built Bath.

LEIR II., 858 - 789 B.C.—The "King Lear" of Shakespeare.  
Built Leicester.

DUNWALL or MOLUTIUS, 473 - 433 B.C.—Restored paramount rule and besides enacting the Molmutian Laws and the Laws of Sanctuary was also a great road builder. He built the strategic road system of Britain to enable the horsed chariots to be moved about the country expeditiously. Later the Roman modified them to make it easier to move their legions and more difficult for the Britons to move their un-shod horses.

It will be seen how false is the commonly held idea that 2,000 years ago Britain was populated by a collection of savage tribes, more or less naked and painted with woad. They must have been remarkably tough people to have survived our climate without clothes.

As the centre of Druidic teaching Britain was looked upon as the "Holy Island." The Gauls were Druids. The religion was anything but the infamous one it was made out to be by those Roman detractors who wished to defame everything Christian and British because of their complete failure to subdue the British.

Britain was not only the religious centre of Western Europe but also the educational centre. In its many universities the students numbered at times as many as 60,000 of the youth and nobility of Britain, Gaul and other parts of Europe. It required twenty years for a bard, who would probably have been the equivalent of a modern university graduate, to master the teaching necessary to become a Druid, who would be comparable to a Fellow of the Royal Society of to-day. The subjects to be mastered included natural philosophy, astronomy, mathematics, geometry, medicine, jurisprudence, poetry and oratory.

The British Mother Druidic Church taught the omniscience of the One Invisible God and the coming of the Messiah, who was known, astonishingly enough, by His name in the pure Celtic form of "Yesu." A translation from a reading in the ancient Celtic Triads is:—

“The Lord our God is One.  
Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be  
ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the  
King of Glory shall come in.  
Who is the King of Glory? The Lord Yesu;  
He is the King of Glory.”

How the Druidic priesthood knew the consecrated name so long beforehand is a mystery.

In Britain the name Jesus never assumed its Greek or Latin form. It was always “Yesu.”

The motto of the Druids was “The Truth against the World.”

Ancient Greek and Roman writers refer to the high culture and learning of the British, and Julius Caesar, following his campaign in Britain, 55 B.C., wrote with admiration of their culture, their sterling character, ingenuity in commerce and craftsmanship. He refers in amazement to the number of populous cities, the architecture, universities of learning, the numerical population of England, and particularly to their religion with its belief in the immortality of the soul.

The Latin poet Martial, a Spaniard, wrote—“For mountains, bridges, rivers, temples and fair women Britain is past compare.”

At this time Britain was the only free country in the world and it was the constant help given to the Gauls by the warriors of Britain which caused Caesar to embark on his punitive expeditions, which were dismal failures. His famous legend, “Veni, Vidi, Vici” (“I came, I saw, I conquered”) was satirized by the pens of the Roman élite who wrote in rebuke, “I came, I saw, but failed to stay.”

In the Ancient world the Druids were the only priesthood of peace. They were strongly against slavery and for freedom of the individual.

We now come to Joseph of Arimathea who was, according to the Talmud, the younger brother of the father of the Virgin Mary and therefore a great uncle to the Lord Jesus. He was a man of refinement, well educated and possessed of many talents. He had unusual political and business ability and was reputed to be one of the wealthiest men of the world at that time, being a metal magnate controlling the tin and lead industry which was then akin in importance to that of steel to-day. Tin was the chief metal for the making of alloys and in great demand by the warring Romans. Many authorities claim that Joseph's world control of tin and lead was due to his vast holdings in the famous, ancient tin mines of Britain. As stated earlier the world's major portion of tin was mined in Cornwall, smelted into ingots and exported throughout the then known civilised world, chiefly in the ships of Joseph, who is reputed to have owned one of the largest private merchant shipping fleets afloat.

It was because of his great power and standing that he was able to defy the Sanhedrin by going to Pilate and boldly claiming the body of our Lord when all others feared to do so.

It appears probable that Joseph continued to support, protect and enable believers to escape from Judea, in face of the persecution by the Sanhedrin and, notably, by Saul. But eventually, in 36 A.D., he, with some companions, was cast adrift in a boat and ended up in Marseilles, which he knew well. He made his way through Gaul and over to Britain, with his companions, where he was well received by the royal family and granted 12 hides of land at Glastonbury, in perpetuity and tax-free.

Here the first Gentile Christian Church in the world was built and the Gospel was preached to the British who accepted it readily, as a natural development of their Druidic faith.

It is to be noted that this first British Church received its teaching direct from the Holy Land and at the hands of people with close personal connections with Christ.

The Gospel was spread with the help of other missionaries arriving in Britain later, including Simon Zelotes, Aristobulus and St. Paul.

The Christian faith spread rapidly in Britain and from Britain into Europe. In 42 A.D. the Emperor Claudius issued the fateful decree to destroy Christian Britain, man, woman and child, and its great institutions and to burn its libraries. In this edict, Claudius proclaimed in the Roman Senate that acceptance of the Druidic or Christian faith was a capital offence, punishable by death by the sword, the torture chamber, or to be cast to the devouring lions in the arena of the Colosseum.

The might of the Roman Empire was turned against Britain and a tremendous war followed with Rome failing to subdue the British although, in turn, for over 40 years the best Roman generals and troops were thrown into the fight. Eventually Britain and Rome made a treaty by which the British retained their kings, lands, laws and rights and the Romans were allowed military bases.

In these wars the Romans were astounded by the military capacity and the bravery of the British and their implacable determination. Their scorn of death was apparently derived from their belief in the immortality of the soul.

As battle-cries the British continued to use "The Truth against the World," now with an increasingly Christian application, and "Britons never shall be slaves," also a very old one. Their kings used the title "Defender of the Faith."

It is interesting to relate that when the British King Caradoc or Caractacus was taken prisoner to Rome with his family, they were there and were Christians when Paul arrived, after being shipwrecked at Malta, as recorded in Acts 28. Caractacus and some members of

his family eventually returned to Britain, but his second son, Linus, remained in Rome and became the first Bishop. The younger daughter of Caractacus, Gladys, who was re-named Claudia by the Emperor, also stayed, having married a Roman noble called Pudens. These three are mentioned by Paul in 2 Tim. 4: 21, and it is therefore clear that the British Royal family of that time and the first Bishop of Rome, a member of that family, were all instructed by Paul in the secret of the Church of the Mystery, of the One Body of Christ, which was revealed by God to Paul only, and the teaching for which is contained in Paul's later Epistles—Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and 2 Timothy—written after the Jews were temporarily set aside at the end of Acts, and the Gospel of Salvation was sent to the Gentiles, through Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles.

It is also noteworthy that between his two imprisonments in Rome Paul is reported to have visited and taught in Britain, so the early Christian Church in Britain would have been instructed in the most glorious truth open to believers.

From the beginning of these wars to the end of the Diocletian persecutions in 320 A.D. millions of Britons must have given their lives for the Christian faith. The ancient Briton appears to have better realised than does the modern one that the faith of Christ sets men free and that freedom can only be preserved in maintaining the Christian faith.

In 156 A.D., King Lucius, by Edict, made the very important solemn declaration to the world that Britain was officially a Christian nation by Act of Parliament. This Act is described in the British Triads in the following few words—

“King Lucius was the first in the Isle of Britain who bestowed the privilege of country and nation and judgment and validity of oath upon those who should be of the faith of Christ.”

This describes one of the most momentous events in Christian history, officially establishing Lucius as the first Christian king by national Act of Council, and Britain as the first officially Christian nation.

This event was welcomed by Christians in other lands. Sabellius, writing in A.D. 250, says:—

“Christianity was privately confessed elsewhere, but the first nation that proclaimed it as their religion, and called itself Christian, after the name of Christ, was Britain.”

Genebrand declares:—

“The glory of Britain consists not only in this, that she was the first country which in a national capacity publicly professed herself Christian, but that she made this confession when the Roman Empire itself was pagan and a cruel persecutor of Christianity.”

This must have been the greatest period in British history, this first three centuries of the Christian era. It was British missionaries

who carried the faith back to Europe and when it seemed as though Christianity was crushed on the Continent by the murderous Diocletian persecution it was Constantine, of Royal British blood, who took a British army across the seas and smashed the Diocletian-Maximian armies so that they never rose again and ended Roman persecution of Christians for all time. Constantine then declared Rome Christian. Thus Britain was the first officially Christian nation and Rome did not become so until it was declared so by a Briton at the head of a British army.

Constantine moved to Constantinople and remained faithful to the form of Christianity always followed in Britain, i.e., that which had been obtained directly from the East and was based on the sure Word of Truth, the Bible. The British Church was called the Holy Catholic Church and it is not to be confused with the man-made system of religion which eventually developed in Rome and became known as the Roman Catholic Church.

Two years after he was hailed Emperor at Rome, Constantine called the first Christian Church Council at Arles in 314 A.D. A second was held at Nicæa, A.D. 325, at which Constantine presided and it is recorded that of 318 Bishops present only 10 were Latin-speaking. The third great council was held at Constantinople in A.D. 337. Although the Bishop of Rome was present it was the Bishop of Constantinople who presided. At every Council, the representative of each country took his seat in the order in which each land had received Christianity. At all times, and at every convention that ever followed, the British Bishop retained the first seat. Nearly a thousand years later, when Italy and Spain challenged the priority of Britain, at the Council of Pisa, A.D. 1417, the Council of Constance, A.D. 1419, the Council of Sienna, A.D. 1423, and the Council of Basle, A.D. 1434, it was the Pope who affirmed the seniority of the British Church on the grounds that "Joseph of Arimathea brought the faith to Britain immediately after the Passion of Christ." As late as 1931, Pope Pius XI. received at the Vatican the visiting English Roman Catholic Mayors of Bath, Colchester and Dorchester, along with 150 members of The Friends of Italy Society. In his address to them he said that St. Paul, not Pope Gregory, first introduced Christianity into Britain. This statement is quoted from a report made in the London "Morning Post," March 27th, 1931. In fact, St. Paul was authoritatively the first to deliver the Message from Rome, though his appointed representative Aristobulus preceded him. Joseph of Arimathea had come to Britain direct from Palestine via Marseilles. He did not come through Rome and preceded Paul in Britain by twenty years.

The first Bishop of Rome to accept the false title of Pope was Boniface III, who accepted it after his predecessor as Bishop, Gregory I., had refused it. The office was created in A.D. 610 by the Emperor Phocas who wanted to demote and spite Bishop Ciriacus of Constan-

tinople, who had justly excommunicated him for his having caused the assassination of his predecessor, Emperor Mauritius.

When the British Bishops first met Augustine in this country they flatly declined his attempt to get them to acknowledge the authority of Rome saying:—

“We are the British Church, the Archbishop of which is accountable to God alone, having no superior on earth.”

Blackstone, the great English jurist, wrote:—

“The ancient British Church was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome, and all his pretended authorities.”

Sir Francis Bacon, writing in “Government of England,” says:—

“The Britons told Augustine they would not be subject to him, nor let him pervert the ancient laws of their Church. This was their resolution and they were as good as their word, for they maintained the liberty of their Church five hundred years after this time, and were the last of all the Churches of Europe that gave their power to the Roman Beast, and in the person of Henry VIII., that came of their blood by Owen Tudor, the first that took that power away again.”

In the very short space above an effort has been made to indicate our glorious past in the times when we are now being brainwashed into thinking we had no history.

There is a mass of material in ancient writings in museums and in old churches and in libraries both in Britain and abroad to support the above, but if anyone wishes to study the subject further a list of books is given in the bibliography at the end which should suffice, as a start.

During the centuries that have followed we know the British have been, more or less, a people of the Bible, who have built up and spread about the world a Christian civilisation and a knowledge of the Bible.

In recent times there has been an alarmingly successful brainwashing campaign to make the British ashamed of having acquired an Empire. This, of course, is a foul mis-representation. There are available the stories of the lives of countless Britons of the finest type to give the lie to this foul campaign. To go no further, a book all should read is “Let the Great Story be Told,” by H. Wood Jarvis. In this is told the stories of how the various parts of the Empire came to be started as a result of the remarkable lives of various men from Capt. John Smith, in Virginia, to Sir Harry Smith in South Africa.

During the last hundred years there has been a terrible turning away, with ever-gathering speed, from the Truth of the Bible to the Lie of false religion or to materialism.

Probably the main cause of this has been the successful propagation of the false theory of evolution. It is only necessary to examine this theory to realise that no sane man could accept it and that it is not



based on scientific facts and sound deductions, but that it is merely a kind of religious faith clung to in desperation by men who do not want to admit the existence of God or the truth of His Word. In fact, men who wish to believe the lie of Satan, when he tempted Eve—"Ye shall not surely die—Ye shall be as gods."

It passes the writer's understanding how men can prefer to believe that they are accidental descendants from a speck of mud, through the lower animals, rather than to believe that they are descended from a man created by God in His image, as He has been at great pains to tell us.

The ordinary Briton, of course, has just been brainwashed into thinking that evolution is a proved fact because he always sees and hears it referred to as such. The falsity of the theory has been exposed thoroughly in the writings of a number of learned men and some of these are listed in the bibliography.

It is probably not generally realised that it is the lie of the evolution theory and the outlook it produces which gives a great impetus to such creeds as Communism and Nietzsche-ism and to various false religions. It also encourages many of the less desirable human traits by tending to cut out God and persuade man that there is nothing higher than man, that he is in the process of becoming god-like.

The writer is one of those many millions of Christians who know, or have known throughout the ages, that the Bible not only contains the Word of God but that it is the Word of God and, as written in the original Hebrew and Greek, is the Words of God, as St. Paul tells us in 2 Tim. 3: 16, where he says it is "given by inspiration of God"—"God-inbreathed," the Greek being "theopneustos." And St. Peter tells us in 2 Peter 1: 21, that holy men of God spake in old time as they were moved by Divine power. The word "moved"—"borne along," Greek "phero." In other words they could not help themselves.

And remember that the Scriptures they were referring to were the Old Testament, in particular, as the New Testament was only in the process of being compiled.

This knowledge that the Bible is the Word of God is given to believers by the Holy Spirit, at the appropriate time, but it is supported by incontrovertible proofs that it cannot be otherwise. The internal evidence based on a common-sense and humble, inspired examination of what it says and of its structure and numerics is conclusive. In addition to this the external evidence all points the same way. No one has ever been able to prove the Bible to be wrong and all scientific and other evidence found, which has any bearing on it, only adds further proof to the truth of the Bible.

We modern British are very fortunate in that we have available to open up the Bible to us the unique works of Mr. C. H. Welch, one of the greatest Englishmen of all time and, obviously, a man raised by

God to act as a kind of latter day St. Paul, by recovering for us the truth for us which was committed to Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles.

From the foregoing it will be seen that throughout the ages the British have stood alone, if necessary, against the world for the truth of the Christian faith, as written in the Bible, against the various distortions being circulated under Satanic influence. If Britain had gone into the Common Market she would have been guilty of a terrible betrayal of the whole of her past because she would have put herself under the control of foreigners in countries which are largely either Roman Catholic, i.e., following a form of religion not firmly based on the Word of God, or Communist, i.e., atheistic; both of which conceptions are totalitarian. In the same way that mixing the Common and Civil Laws has led to the virtual elimination of the Common Law, so would the mixing of the truth and the lie in the Christian faith lead to the corruption which would eventually produce a form of religion which would delude people into worshipping anti-Christ. The moves to unite churches, and organisations like the World Council of Churches, are all moves in this direction. Even the organised Protestant Churches have strayed a long way from the pure truth of the Word. For example, one wonders how many ministers in the modern Anglican Church know the Bible to be the Word of God.

# In Conclusion.

**I**N the foregoing sections an attempt has been made to indicate very briefly the fundamental issues involved in our situation. It is impossible to study our history without realising that we are a people who have played a quite exceptional part in the world. In spite of all our faults in the various ways common to mankind it appears that we have been specially used by God to serve His purposes in keeping alive and spreading about the world a knowledge of His Truth and with it a form of decent Christian civilisation. To anyone who sees these truths it is tragic to see the terrible state we have been brain-washed into now, in which we have been in danger of betraying our whole past for an entirely illusory mess of potage, by joining the Common Market.

We must take immediate steps to put an end to this insane state of affairs. It is respectfully suggested that Her Majesty the Queen should take the following action—

1. Call the nation to a National Day of Prayer for us to be guided to serve God fully in accordance with His Will.
2. Dissolve the present Parliament and order a General Election with freedom of election, as laid down in our fundamental law.
3. Order her Privy Council to take over the government of the country, appointing to the Council men of integrity and ability, who will not be members of the Commons.

When this Privy Council takes over the Government it will be faced with a tremendous mess to clear up but most of the essential steps to be taken follow naturally from a recognition of the fundamental factors involved, as indicated in this paper.

Clearly it would be necessary for the Government to:—

1. Take over the issue of money and credit to enable a full use of the national potential to be developed and maintained. A number of schemes as to how best to do this have been worked out and are available for consideration. Attention is called particularly to the suggestions in "The Modern Idolatry," by Jeffrey Mark.
2. Take a lead in developing much closer ties with the other Dominions, particularly the old white ones, in order to preserve the British world as far as possible.
3. Make it quite clear that we are not going to give up our sovereignty to the Common Market or any other form of internationalism.
4. Make it quite clear to the Government of the U.S. that we wish to co-operate with them in the fullest and friendliest way, but that it is not possible to do so until they give up their policy of

doing all they can to destroy the British world and Christian civilisation in general.

5. Take steps to make the fundamental issues involved in situations, as they arise, clear to the British people so that the public can understand and co-operate wholeheartedly.
6. Withdraw from U.N.O., G.A.T.T., I.M.F. and other organisations designed to weaken us.
7. Stand no truck with Communism in any of its guises and oppose it resolutely in every way possible.
8. Make an end to British Government policies of recent years of running away from every enemy or coloured upstart of the most revolting kind, like Jomo Kenyatta and Nkrumah; and of letting down in the most shameful way our own kith and kin and the people of other races who have been loyal to us.
9. Take action to bring such organisations as the Banking System, the Bureaucracy and the Trade Unions under the fundamental requirements of the Common Law.

It is clear that payment of members of the House of Commons from the public funds should cease with the dissolution of this Parliament.

As soon as we try to break the chains binding us we will find ourselves up against the world, mobilised by the Money Power, as has always happened when any country has tried to break the Money Power grip. Very few people realise that a main aim of Napoleon, Mussolini, Kemel Ataturk and Hitler was to free their countries from the same menace. The Money Power won because, except in the case of the Turk, it was able to use the British to do the fighting, with the aid of various allies, but that was because the British did not know what it was all about. It makes for a comparatively sane conduct of diplomacy and war if the leaders of the nation have some idea as to what are the fundamental factors involved.

A main reason, of course, for the destruction of the British world which has been going on during this century is that the Satanic forces of evil know very well that if the British world system had been allowed to develop its potential strength, and if the British people had ever become alive to what was going on and had given up usury and retained their Christian faith, they would have been unbeatable by any worldly forces that it would be feasible to bring against them. Hence the idea of putting us in the Common Market chains to complete the process of eliminating us.

Many people might think it an absurd idea that a handful of men could maintain through the ages a successful policy of bringing the world into subjection. But there is ample evidence of how it has been done in the books available, of which a representative number have been given in the Bibliography at the end. For the purpose of this

paper it has not been possible to do more than mention some salient factors.

Besides the evidence mentioned above we also have the very definite evidence in the Bible, of which a few indications will be given here.

As mentioned before, Nimrod tried to ensure a one-world order. God scattered people into nations and languages about the earth to prevent centralisation under a world authority. The whole point of big business methods, of wiping out small and private businesses, of destroying a large number of independent nations and merging them into ever larger political combinations, is to facilitate control and take-over and the eventual attainment of world government under Satanic control, leading up to mankind being duped into worshipping anti-Christ. The use of the usurious banking system being the main means of enslaving mankind.

We know from the Bible that there are two kinds of men in the world, those that are the seed of God and those that are the seed of Satan. See the parable of the Wheat and the Tares. For example, we are told that Cain, Judas Iscariot and the men talking to our Lord in John 8: 33-47, were of the Devil. It is clear that in the same way that God leads and inspires His seed to serve His purpose, Satan can move his seed to use them in opposing God's purpose in Christ. Normally men are not aware of being used, in either way.

It is also made clear to us in Dan. 10: 13, that Satan had his supernatural beings, fallen angels, who are working to control nations from behind the scenes. The one who was appointed to supervise Persia was so powerful that he was able to hold up the angel of the Lord for twenty-one days until Michael, the archangel, came to his assistance. And, for example, see Eph. 6: 12.

It is only necessary to see the state the world is in now and to read the Bible, particularly Daniel, Revelation and such passages as 2 Tim. 3: 1-8 and 2 Peter 3: 1-7, to realise that we are now getting into the latter days leading up to the appearance of the Beast and anti-Christ and the return of our Lord.

During our life-time each one of us has to make the decision as to acknowledging the Lord Jesus Christ as our saviour. If we make the decision to acknowledge Him we get eternal life, although we have to go through the process of dying and sleeping in the grave until resurrected. We will then appear before the judgment seat of Christ and be judged as to the worthiness of our walk after becoming Christians. We cannot lose our eternal life in that judgment because that became freely ours when we acknowledged Christ, although we do not actually put on immortality until after resurrection. We have no immortal soul until then as is made quite clear in the Bible, starting with Genesis 3: 22-24. What we can lose in this judgment are the extra rewards available for those who have walked worthy and earned such a commendation as "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Any people, like those who are of the seed of Satan, and who are not being given eternal life will be destroyed, i.e., they will suffer the second death. There is no Biblical foundation for the idea that such people will suffer eternal conscious torment in hell fire.

But besides this individual question there seems to the writer to be a possibility that there is some sort of a judgment of the nations and, if this is so, it would be a terrible tragedy if, in the final years, we just gave up and deserted to the enemy after having had the tremendous privilege of being used in some ways for so long as a kind of servant nation, to the glory of God. And, even if there is no question of obtaining any sort of national reward it would still be a shameful thing to betray the whole of our past just as we are reaching the end of the long, long trail.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

<b>THE COMPANION BIBLE</b>	Oxford University Press and The Lamp Press	Obtainable from:— Berean Publishing Trust. Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd. The Lamp Press.
Earth's Earliest Ages	G. H. Pember, M.A.	Pickering & Inglis.
The Common Law	Rev. Wm. Pascoe Goard	Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
St. Paul in Britain?	Rev. R. W. Morgan	do.
St. Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury	Rev. L. S. Lewis, M.A.	James Clarke & Co., Ltd.
The Drama of the Lost Disciples	George F. Jowett	Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
Did Our Lord visit Britain as they say in Cornwall and Somerset?	Rev. C. C. Dobson, M.A.	Avalon Press, Glastonbury.
Christ in Cornwall?	Rev. H. A. Lewis	Probably obtainable from the Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
Pre-Historic London	E. O. Gordon	Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
Immortal Britain	A. V. Insole	The Aquarian Press, London.
Phœnician Origin of Britons, Scots and Anglo-Saxons	Prof. L. A. Waddell, LL.D., C.B., C.I.E.	Luzac & Company.
Let the Great Story be Told	H. Wood Jarvis	Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
The Economic Law of the Lord	W. J. Cameron	do.
Christianity the only Practical Solution of Economic Problems	Major W. E. G. Ord-Slatton	do.
Out of Our Disorder	Edwin M. Cunningham	Industrial Christian Fellowship.
A Twentieth Century Economic System	Anonymous	Williams, Lea & Co., Ltd.
The Modern Idolatry	Jeffrey Mark	Chatto & Windus, London.
Human Ecology	Dr. Thomas Robertson	William MacClellan.
Promise to Pay	R. McNair Wilson	Routledge.
The Monopoly of Credit	C. H. Douglas	Chapman & Hall.
Very High Finance	Paul Cahill	Candour Publishing Co.
The Menace of the Money Power	A. K. Chesterton	Yeoman Press, Bristol

Britain's Graveyard. Dangers of the Common Market	A. K. Chesterton	League of Empire Loyalists.
Sound the Alarm	do.	Candour Publishing Co
Stand by the Empire	do.	do.
Beware the Money Power	do.	do.
Betrayal	do.	do.
To-morrow	do.	do.
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements	Nesta Webster	Boswell Publishing Co. Ltd.
Poverty and Over-Taxation	The late Duke of Bedford	Possibly obtainable from the Britons Publishing Society.
Debt-Free Prosperity	do.	do.
The Absurdity of the National Debt	do.	do.
From Admiral to Cabin Boy	Admiral Sir Barry Dom- ville, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G.	do.
The Nameless War	Capt. A. H. M. Ramsay	do.
Advance to Barbarism	F. J. P. Veale	C. C. Nelson Publishing Co.
Crimes Discreetly Veiled	F. J. P. Veale	Britons Publishing Society.
Is Evolution Proved?	H. S. Shelton, Douglas Dewar	Hollis & Carter.
Darwin: Before and After	Robert E. D. Clark, M.A., Ph.D.	Paternoster Press.
The Transformist Illusion	Douglas Dewar	Dehoff Publications.
Man: a Special Creation	Douglas Dewar	Thynne & Co. Ltd.
Why be an Ape?	"A London Journalist"	Uplift Books (Croydon) Ltd.
The Bible and Modern Science	L. Merson Davies, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.	T. & A. Constable Ltd.
Why Colleges Breed Communists	A. N. Field	A. N. Field Publications, New Zealand.
Evolution	A Medical Scientist	International Christian Crusade, Toronto.

All the above and many other works exposing the lie of the evolution theory are obtainable, if still available, from the Hon. Sec. of the Evolution Protest Movement, Mr. A. G. Tilney of Santhia, Stoke, Hayling Island, Hants.



An Alphabetical Analysis (10 Volumes)	C. H. Welch	The Berean Publishing Trust 40 Tumblewood Road, Banstead, Surrey.
Dispensational Truth	do.	do.
The Apostle of the Reconciliation	do.	do.
From Pentecost to Prison	do.	do.
Life Through His Name	do.	do.
Just and the Justifier	do.	do.
Testimony of the Lord's Prisoner	do.	do.
Prize of the High Calling	do.	do.
This Prophecy	do.	do.
The Unfolding Purpose of God	Stuart Allen	do.
God's Present Purpose	A. H. Morton	do.
Number in Scripture	E. W. Bullinger D.D.	Lamp Press.
God Counts	W. E. Filmer, B.A.	Uplift Books (Croydon) Ltd.

---

As regards Constitutional Law reference could be made to a whole library of legal works. An exhaustive search of these has been made by a Mr. Ben Greene to show how corruption has crept into the English Constitution and if the result of this labour is ever published it would cover the subject very well. The writer wishes to acknowledge the help some of Mr. Greene's work has been in writing the first section of this booklet.

---

A very interesting and revealing range of publications dealing with the Money Power and with Communism is available from Intelligence Publications, St. Peter's House, 8 Warkworth Street, Cambridge, England.

